



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/965,031 09/27/2001		François Pachet	450117-03506	2592		
20999	7590	02/14/2006	•	EXAM	EXAMINER	
		ENCE & HAUG	LU, KUEN S			
745 FIFTH AVENUE- 10TH FL. NEW YORK, NY 10151			ART UNIT PAPER N			
				2167		

DATE MAILED: 02/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/965,031	PACHET ET AL.	•
Examiner	Art Unit	
Kuen S. Lu	2167	

		Kuen S. Lu	2107	
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence ado	Iress
THE R	EPLY FILED <u>20 January 2006</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.	
t F	The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on nis application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant me periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in (fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) [$\overline{\underline{}}$ The period for reply expires $\underline{\underline{3}}$ months from the mailing date	e of the final rejection.		
b) [The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin	g date of the final rejecti	ion.
	TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	, ,		
nave be under 3 set forti may ree	ons of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date sen filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex 7 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the solid in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later duce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) SE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ice action; or (2) as
	The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	oliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two mont	hs of the date of
— f	ling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed DMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	
	The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered b	ecause
_	a) They raise new issues that would require further co			00000
•	b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	•	,,	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or	tter form for appeal by materially re	ducing or simplifying	the issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.	
	NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
4. 🔲	The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
	Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)	-		
r	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s).		-	_
r	For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) now the new or amended claims would be rejected is prothe status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		ll be entered and an	explanation of
	Claim(s) allowed:			
	Claim(s) objected to:			
	Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-6 and 9-37</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
	AVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
8. 🔲 1	The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, busecause applicant failed to provide a showing of good anwas not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
6	he affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to chowing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a
	The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attac	hed.
	The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	ut does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:
12. 🗌	Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	No(s)	
13. 🔲	Other:			

Continuation of 13. Other: Regarding the Applicant's Amendment after Final, filed on January 20, 2006, please see discussion below:

At Pages 3-4, concerning claim 1, the Applicant argued that the items described in Linden reference cannot be assimilated to the descriptors stored in the database. Moreover, by use of the weighting functions, the scoring is not previously stored as an item descriptor in the database. Furthermore, Linden reference provides no incentive to look for morphological sequence for the sorted list of items.

As to above argument, the Examiner respectfully submits that Linden reference was introduced to provide teaching on weighting values to similar items for scoring, and Sumita reference was combined to make up the teaching of morphological affinity. Please note at col. 2, lines 46-49 of the Linden reference, items in web sites and videos are morphologically separated among each other within each type. Further at col. 9, lines 29-34, Linden teaches both assembling different types of items in the same table or separating items of the same type in different tables. The items or the item types are both stored in the database tables for item description. The types of the items also suggest morphological affinity, for example, CDs type is morphologically closer to Videos than Books. Based on this assessment, the Linden reference does teach items and item types having morphological affinity. It would have been obvious for an ordinary skilled to compensate Linden reference with Sumita's teaching of morpholocal affinity for further sequencing the sorted items or item types.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kuen S. Lu whose telephone number is 571-272-4114. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM to 5 PM, Monday through Friday. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jean R. Homere, Esq. can be reached on (571) 272-3780. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kuen S. Lu Patent Examiner February 9, 2006.